

A Moral evaluation of the Intercultural Approach to Gender Relation: a case study of the Igbo-African-Culture Chidiebere Obi, PhD

A Moral evaluation of the Intercultural Approach to Gender Relation: a case study of the Igbo-African-Culture

Chidiebere Obi, PhD

Department of Philosophy

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Nigeria

ccy.obi@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract

Intercultural approach to gender is a process through which different cultures interact on gender related matters. The reason for this interaction is to learn and exchange ideas on how gender has shaped each other's society in terms of distribution of duties and even the understanding of morality. Experience has shown that this interaction has been marred by the tendency of a 'superior culture' always wanting to act as the yardstick for measuring other cultures. Since gender is culture-based, using a particular culture's understanding of gender as the basis for measuring others will be counterproductive. The Igbo-African-culture has been a victim of this intercultural interaction and therefore calls for some questions: what qualifies an action to be gender marginalizing? If gender roles vary as cultures vary, would the attempt to use a culture's gender understanding as the standard for measuring others not be guilty of

chauvinism? This paper attempts to answer these questions amongst others thereby submitting that the best solution to the perceived gender inequalities in any given culture (Igbo-African-Culture as a case study) is the one obtained from a thorough moral evaluation of the traces of inequalities in a people's culture in line with the peculiarity and uniqueness of culture and not the solution obtained through the lens of a 'superior culture'. This is because, what obtains in a culture may not be the case in another. This does not mean that the paper is against the exchange of ideas between cultures but on the contrary, it is another way of saying that a culture should not borrow what may destabilize the foundation of its existence.

KEYWORDS: *gender, culture, intercultural, Igbo-African-culture*

Introduction

Gender inequality has generated so many reactions from scholars all over the globe; each of these reactions is informed by the context (culture) from where the person argues. These reactions to gender inequality are grouped under the umbrella called *feminism*. The term feminism (as understood to mean radical approach to the system of patriarchy) has also been contested by scholars (more especially scholars from African extract) to be a European ideology which is highly a confrontational approach by the women against the stronghold of their men. As a result of this, many African

feminist scholars (such as; Akachi Adimora Ezeigbo, Ogundipe, Acholonu etc) prefer concepts like; 'Womanism', 'Snail Sense Feminism', 'Stiwanism', 'Motherism' etc to feminism. What this is telling us is that gender related issues are to be approached contextually and not treated as the same. Many feminists are prone to using the mainstream (such as the European) culture's understanding of gender inequality as the yardstick for measuring gender related matters and this is tantamount to *descriptive chauvinism*; that is, trying to describe another people's tradition in the image of one's own. Therefore, intercultural approach to gender should take into consideration the peculiarities of a people's way of life and the way their worldview has been constituted.

Igbo is one of the major tribes in Nigeria with a unique culture which also embodies gender relation. This gender relation encompasses both parts that are not humane and parts that are so designed to complement the wholeness of the communalistic existence. Those parts in the Igbo's gender relation that are not humane had been condemned in many literatures and judicial processes and by implication considered morally wrong. The problem is when the same hammer is been used on those parts that depict the uniqueness of the Igbo person. This problem always emanates from borrowing the radical western approach to gender relation which always seeks to upturn and holistically change the structure of a society which they believe is male-dominated thereby causing a huge damage to

feminist approach is to seek to abolish those inhuman treatments and injustices that have been adjudged morally wrong. This raises a question on the moral justification of applying a culture's gender relation into an entirely different culture. This is the problem the paper seeks to address and to do justice to this, the paper will first have an overview of how gender relation and feminism are conceived in the Western and African thoughts; secondly, it will resolve the question on what makes a particular gender relation morally condemnable thereby calling for abolishment of such relation. This will now pave way for the discourse on the ideal way gender relation should be conceived in line with moral justifiability.

Theoretical Framework

In trying to consider the moral implication of intercultural approach to gender relation, the paper will have recourse to two ethical theories namely: Immanuel Kant's duty ethics (with special emphasis on the first two formulations of categorical imperative) and Utilitarianism. The choice of these two was to facilitate a balance moral evaluation and also because, the two theories represent the two major normative ethical theories: *Deontology* and *Teleology*. While Kantian ethics represents *Deontology*, Utilitarianism will stand for *Teleology*. Deontology derives its name from the Greek word for duty: *deon*. As an ethical theory, it considers what one's duty and obligations are in determining what is

considers what one's duty and obligations are in determining what is morally good or bad. According to Thomas M. Powers:

Deontology refers to a general category of ethical or moral theories that define right action in terms of duties and moral rules. Deontologists focus on the rightness of an act and not on what results from the act. Right action may end up being pleasant or unpleasant for the agent, may meet with approval or condemnation from others, and may produce pleasure, riches, pain, or even go unnoticed. What is crucial on this view is that right action is required, and that the goal of moral behavior is simply that it is performed.

The slogan of much of deontology is that the right is independent of the good.¹

Deontology is in sharp contrast with any ethical theory that considers consequences of an act in determining its goodness or wrongness. This is because, for the deontologists, it is as matter of duty or obligation to always do the right thing not minding the

possible consequences. If asked why, simply answer that it right to do the right thing. The questions here are: what is the right thing to do? How do we know our duties and obligations?

To answer these questions, we will turn to types of deontology namely; Kantianism and divine command theory. For the purpose of this work, we will only refer to Kantianism.

As a deontologist, Kant argued that rightness of an action is independent of its consequences rather a right act is that that flows from duty simply because it is one's duty. What determines the rightness of an action is the proper intention/motive without having any inducement like: pursuit of pleasure or avoidance of pain. Sequel to this, right actions must flow from good will which according to Kant is the only thing that is good without qualification.

Thus, Kant writes: “the only thing that is good without qualification or restriction is a good will...a good will alone is good in all circumstances...an absolute or unconditioned good...the only thing that is good in itself”.²

An action that flows from a good will even though it may not achieve its good aims remains a right action provided that it flows from a good will. “The goodness of the good will is not derived from the goodness of the results which it produces... Besides, a good will continues to have its own unique goodness even where, by some misfortune, it is unable to produce the results at which it aims”.³

Kant believes that an act is morally praiseworthy only if done

neither for self-interested reasons nor as the result of a natural disposition, but rather from duty.⁴ Duty is to be performed entirely for its known sake, not in order to promote human happiness or fulfilment.⁵ For instance, a student that swept a classroom simply because he saw it dirty acted from duty than another student that reluctantly swept a dirty classroom just because the duty-roster says so. The two students did the right thing but the first was the only one that acted from duty; the second acted only to avoid punishment.

Moral duties are derived from moral laws which come to us in the form of imperatives and are categorical in nature. This informs Kant's concept of categorical imperative as distinguished from hypothetical imperative which is conditional. Categorical imperative simply implores one to do the right thing not minding any pleasurable results while hypothetical imperative states; 'if you want to achieve B, you should do A'. Categorical imperative simply says; 'do A'.

In Kant's *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*, he outlines the *Categorical Imperative* in three different ways. We will now consider these formulations:

Universal Law formulation: "Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law." This formulation simply implores one to always carry out universalizable acts. Sequel to this, one should desist from actions that cannot be universalized. For instance, keeping to one's promises is a universalizable act while breaking one's promises is

not because it has defeated the purpose of any possible universal law from it.

Humanity or End in Itself formulation: "Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end." This formulation simply underscores the worth and value of a human person who ought to be treated always as an end. Judging from this, breaking of one's promises to a friend is treating the friend as a means and not as an end.

Kingdom of Ends formulation: "So act as if you were always through your maxims a law-making member in a universal kingdom of ends". Finally, this formulation establishes the autonomy and freedom of a person as a being capable of making universal laws through his actions.

As plausible as Kantianism may seem, it is not devoid of faults. Kantianism is plausible because of its unique way of describing the ideal moral agent and its recognition of the value and dignity of the human person. But it can be faulted considering the mutability and frailty of the human person. Kant's ethics is so rigid that it fails to take cognizance of the peculiarities and circumstances of being human rather presenting an image of a God-like being who must always adhere strictly to the rightness. This is because Kantianism frowns at exceptions and also fails to proffer solutions to conflicting duties. For instance, someone who has the duty to always tell the truth and the duty to always save life when having conflict of these

two may not get solution from Kantianism.

On the other hand, Teleology [from the Greek *telos*, meaning aim or purpose] represents those ethical theories that consider the consequences of an action in determining its rightness or wrongness. A good action is that which its consequences bring more advantages than disadvantages to greater number. This is why it is also called *consequentialism*. Teleological moral theories locate moral goodness in the consequences of our behavior and not the behavior itself.⁶

According to Hull:

Teleological theories: hold that an action is morally right either if a person doing it brings about the best attainable consequences in the situation, or if the action is of a kind which would have the best attainable consequences if everyone did it in that sort of situation. it is the goodness or badness of the consequences of actions alone that makes them right or wrong, rather than anything intrinsically good or bad about the actions themselves. Thus, on this

view, there would be no universal moral prohibition against deliberately killing another human if so doing would produce a greater balance of good over evil than any other course of action open at that time. Because these theories usually involve the notion of utility in producing good consequences, they are often called utilitarian theories.⁷

This is in sharp contrast to deontology that does not consider the consequences (good and pleasurable) rather the intrinsic nature of the act itself flowing from duty. Teleological ethical theories are more concerned with the pragmatic importance of a particular act. For the purpose of this research, we shall use utilitarianism to represent teleology

As a teleological ethical theory, utilitarianism considers the consequences of an action in determining its rightness or otherwise. Just as the name goes, the goodness of an action is determined by its utility. The good act is the one that brings more pleasure than pain to a greater number of people. This view of equating goodness with pleasure is called hedonism.

The seminal figure of utilitarianism is Jeremy Bentham while John

Stuart Mill improved on it. While Bentham was advocating for the maximization of pleasure over pain (hedonism), Mill was talking about the quality of pleasure.

According to Ekwutosi:

Bentham began with a simplistic equation of goodness and pleasure. Such hedonistic utilitarianism was soon seen to be a faulty explanation since it logically leads to the conclusion that, for example, a happy pig is in a more fortunate condition than Socrates. Mill improved the theory by recognizing that it is not merely the quantity of pleasure that is important but its quality. He maintains that it is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. Thus he distinguishes between higher and lower pleasure.⁸

For a better understanding of Utilitarianism, we will now briefly discuss its two types namely: Act and Rule Utilitarianism.

Act utilitarianism holds that the rightness and wrongness of an action are to be determined by the number affected by the goodness of its consequences regardless of rules. It holds that the rightness or wrongness of an action is to be judged by the consequences, good or bad, of the action itself.⁹ We can only keep to the rules if they accidentally help in maximizing utility. For instance, an act utilitarian will admonish one to break his promises provided that by so doing, the consequences will bring more good than harm to a greater number but if keeping to one's promise will facilitate the same result, one should do so. At the end, what matters is the number that benefitted from a particular act and not the rule or duty. Act utilitarianism is the most faithful of all utilitarian doctrines, to the spirit of utilitarianism.¹⁰

Rule utilitarianism on the other hand can be said to be a combination of act utilitarianism and deontology. This is because it advocates for the observation of rule even while maximizing good consequences. According to Omoregbe:

Rule utilitarianism holds that moral rules must be based on the principle of utility. Before adopting a rule, for example we should ask ourselves “would useful consequences result from everybody adopting and obeying this rule?” Only those rules should be

adopted which, if observed by everybody, would produce the best possible results for the greatest number of people. Once it has been adopted on this basis, it must be observed by everybody; its violation then becomes immoral.¹¹

Corroborating the above view, J. J. C. Smart writes: “rule utilitarianism is the view that the rightness or wrongness of an action is to be judged by the goodness or badness of the consequences of a rule that everyone should perform the action in like circumstances.”¹²

The question rule utilitarianism may not resolve in line with the tenets of utilitarianism is: what happens when the observation of the adopted rule will lead to bad consequences than good? If a rule utilitarian advises that we should still stick to the rule, it then disqualifies rule utilitarianism from the belief of the utilitarians which is to maximize utility. This is why rule utilitarianism has been criticized for its internal inconsistency. This critique was captured by Tailton when he argued that rule utilitarianism could recommend acts that accord with the best set of rules even when these rules are not in fact generally accepted in a particular circumstance, and when as a result, these acts would have devastating bad consequences.¹³

Utilitarianism as an ethical theory has been applauded by many as a result of its self-evident, its pragmatic approach to moral decision making its ability for proffering solution to conflicting moral choices etc. This is because it's crystal clear that people usually act to maximize utility. Thus, J. Bentham writes: “whatever may be the reason for which people act or think they act, if question is raised, why we ought to perform certain action, we shall ultimately have to answer in terms of the principle of utility.”¹⁴

Apart from its plausibility, utilitarianism has been criticized for its inability to see any intrinsic goodness rather believing in conventional one, its advocacy for infinite consequences, the end justifying the means etc.

These two theories as explained above will be used to evaluate the problems arising from the intercultural approach to gender relation and they will also be employed in striking a proper balance in the intercultural understanding of gender relation.

Gender relation and Feminism in the Western and African thoughts compared

Gender relation means the way a given society assigns and delineated duties to be performed by man and woman and this also shapes the way they relate to one another. This relationship between the two sexes could be mutually complementary or a confrontational one. It is mutually complementary when it helps to foster solidarity and community coexistence and it becomes

confrontational when it is perceived as a means through which a particular sex marginalizes and exploits the other. Marginalization and exploitation of one sex against the other led to inequality in gender and this informs the several reactions and efforts towards the emancipation of this marginalized and exploited sex. These reactions and efforts are all grouped under the umbrella called Feminism. So, feminism is the belief in the equal right and opportunity for both sexes. Going by the meaning of gender relation above, it is clear that it is society based and as such varies from one society to another. Therefore, any problem arising from this relation must also vary. It cannot be the same. Owing to this fact, we will briefly consider the different ways the western and African thoughts approach this.

Going by all the classifications of western feminism, the major climax is its radical dimension. This is as a result of the perceived patriarchy by the female folk. The agitations in the first, second and third waves feminist classifications culminated into a radical and confrontational approach to upturn the male dominated system the aftermath which is different feminist groups emerging with different claims on how women should regain their freedom. A typical example of such claim is that of Simone de Beauvoir who argued against motherhood and family; these according to her are some of marginalizing tools used by men to retard the growth and progress of the women. To her, “marriage enslaves her, making her absolutely passive; she is married. She takes his name, belongs to

his religion, his class, his circle, she joins his family, and she becomes his 'half'. She follows wherever his work calls him and determines their place of residence... becoming attached to her husband's universe, she gives him her person, virginity and a rigorous fidelity being required".¹⁵ "De Beauvoir sees motherhood, childcare, marriage as well as the upkeep of the home as hindrances to feminism as well as anti-feminist tradition, which reduce women to the condition of beast of burden".¹⁶ These according to her are some of the factors that make women the weaker sex and men stronger; while men are the 'actors', women on the other hand, are the 'reactors'. This approach permeates other western feminist movements and ideologies such as: Eco-feminism, Amazon-feminism, Lesbian-feminism etc. These are different western feminist views that seek to reduce the 'overriding power' of men in order to enthrone freedom for women. The radical western feminist view is anchored on the belief that the only way to ensure women's 'absolute' freedom is to demystify the absolute control and power their men have on them and this can be achieved by radically changing all the special rights and positions men enjoy thereby creating a new world order where women will enjoy absolute freedom.

The above western radical feminist approach may be informed by the western ontology which is purely bi-polar and underscores western individualism as opposed the African traditional communalism. Marriage in the western world is seen as a purely

hedonistic partnership and whereby if the pleasure derived therein is no more, it behooves of the parties to go their separate ways. This is an individualistic approach to marriage different from the African complementary approach. Realities in the western worldview do not interpenetrate one another. This informs their gender relation where a particular sex believes that fighting the injustices meted it can only be achieved by breaking away (absolute freedom) from the other sex.

African understanding of gender relation (in its original sense) on the other hand is purely a complimentary one where it takes man and woman to coexist as partners in progress. This does not mean that this relationship has been rosy for we still have traces of injustices such as; inhumane widowhood practices, genital mutilation, virginity testing, inheritance problems etc which are rapidly phasing off. The point we are trying to state is that the African (especially the Igbo) 'interpenetratedness' of realities has made her gender relation to be complementary. Man and woman play their roles as partners in order to ensure a complementary whole. If a woman sees a scorpion and the man kills it; what matters is that the scorpion does not escape to constitute a danger to the whole and not necessary who killed the snake. In the Igbo traditional setting, men are celebrated while their wives are also revered. Corroborating this point, Ukaulor argues: “both men and women work and cooperate for effectiveness in all fields of endeavour; there is mutual man-woman, interdependent, self reliant relationship in the African

society. An Igbo adage justifies this: *ike adighi di kute nwaanyi ya, nwaanyi ekute di ya* (when a husband is not fit to carry his wife, his wife carries him). Men and women are seen as partners in progress. They do not seek to overthrow men nor do they seek domination”.¹⁷ Motherhood is a thing of joy that make it the ideal for every woman and also an Igbo bachelor is treated as *ofeke* (less a man) and does not enjoy the full rights his married counterparts do. This makes the family a fulfilling and complementary platform for both sexes. Mothers are celebrated amongst the Igbo; this can be seen in the names they bear such as; *Nneamaka* (mother is beautiful), *Nnebugwu* (mother is respect), *Nnedimma* (mother is good) etc. In Igbo tradition, the council of chiefs (made up of men) as peace resolution body is also likened to *Umuada* (an association made up of women) which is also saddled with the responsibility of settling disputes. Igbo women like their male counterpart have been contributing their own quota to many social responsibilities. They had and still embarking on many developmental projects in their different communities. The *Aba* women riot of 1929 is a typical example of what the Igbo women can do where they challenged the perceived injustices perpetuated by the British established 'warrant chiefs'. All these go to show the complementary gender relation in the Igbo-African worldview different from the western individualistic and confrontational approach. We are not saying that the European women do not perform some of the above mentioned roles African women perform but we are only saying that the

difference between these two is that while the Western woman does that as an individual and in some cases, as a show of freedom from men, the traditional Igbo woman does hers as a way of complementing the efforts from the man for the benefit of the whole.

The above comparison has unveiled the differences in gender relation and also underscores a must difference in approach to issues arising from such relations. We will now turn to the moral appraisal.

Moral Evaluation

Here, effort will be made to morally evaluate some issues arising from gender relations. This will facilitate a better intercultural understanding of gender relation. Another cogent reason for this evaluation is the resultant effects of globalization such as the intercultural exchanges where the cultural traits of the developed countries are seen as the ideals and most times serve as yardsticks for measuring other cultures especially that of the less developed countries. Oftentimes, some Western intoxicated Africans seem to mismanage this intercultural exchanges and thereby seeing every reality in Africa from the Western lens. The selected ethical theories that were explained under the theoretical framework will be employed in this evaluation. Taking motherhood as the first issue arising from our analysis of Western and African thoughts on gender relation, we can say that while the Western radical feminists see motherhood as an impediment to a good gender relation which

serves as a tool for marginalization against women, the traditional Igbo-African thought sees it as something to be cherished. Therefore, morally speaking, the Western radical feminists see motherhood as morally bad while for the traditional Igbo-African thought, such is morally good. The question to ask at this juncture is: why do these two worldviews conceive motherhood differently? The simplest answer to this is that it is as a result of the difference ontology. While being in the Western ontology is understood in its singularity; being in African ontology is understood in its relatedness. So, a Western mother sees her roles as an obstacle to self fulfillment and freedom while an Igbo-African mother sees her motherly role as just a drop in the whole gamut of roles that will qualify her as member of the 'we'. Her duty as a mother is to complement.

To further justify the above argument, it calls for moral justification. Applying Bentham's version of utilitarianism to the Igbo-African goodness of motherhood (this means all the duties performs by the Igbo-African woman such as child bearing, marriage, children upkeep etc) , we can still say that it holds because; according to Bentham's utilitarianism, a good action is that that brings more happiness than pain to greater number of people. The question is: does motherhood bring more happiness to Igbo-African women and men? The answer is in the affirmative. Motherhood is something that every African woman aspires to attain. This is not as a result of the stigma attached to one being a spinster in African as some critics

may argue. To these critics, marriage and motherhood are vehicles of marginalization against the women where women pressurized into marriage against their will and those who remained unmarried to a particular age are treated as outcasts by their families. If this will suffice, then, these critics can be referred to the stigma attached to one being a perpetual bachelor in Igbo-Africa; such a person is seen as *ofeke* (less man) and to be treated as such; by extension, every Igbo-African man also aspires for fatherhood too. This goes to show the pivotal role of marriage as a springboard for the complementary roles played by both man and woman in constituting a whole called 'we'. In line with the Bentham's utilitarian ethical theory, motherhood in the Igbo-African gender relation is morally justifiable. Therefore applying the Western radical feminist yardstick into African context will tantamount to violating the Bentham utilitarian ethical theory; reason is that such will bring more pain than happiness.

In its first and second formulation, Kantian categorical imperative will also justify the above argument. In line with the first formulation (universalization formulation), Motherhood within the Igbo-African context is universalizable because there is nothing wrong in its nature. An Igbo-African woman who wishes a fellow woman with motherhood is welcomed by the later as best of all wishes even when she does not wish to become a mother. Kantian second formulation (the end in itself formulation) can also be used to justify motherhood in the Igbo-African gender relation. This is

because; contrary to the Western radical feminist belief that motherhood is the instrument used by the men to marginalize the women thereby, treating them as means only, the Igbo-African man never sees motherhood in the same light instead, he sees in motherhood an integral part of the whole and if not properly taken care of, will bring about distortion in the 'we' where his fatherhood and status as the 'head' is subsumed. As a result of its goodness, motherhood is not something an Igbo woman should be forced to enter (with the exception of forced marriage) instead, one consents to it; and this is in line with Kant's second formulation. The ideal relationship between an Igbo-African man and woman is I-thou which is characterized with mutuality, care and complementarity and not I-it relationship of manipulation, experimentarity and objectivization which Kantian second formulation seeks to condemn.

The above picture of the Igbo-African gender relation is the ideal one in line with their ontology but does not mean that it is all *uhuru* (well) within such relation. We still have traces of marginalization against women such as: Some inhumane widowhood rites, genital mutilation, and virginity testing etc and applying our selected ethical theories, these our cultural traits will be highly condemnable. This is because; such ill practices bring more pain than happiness to greater number of people and therefore, violates Bentham's utilitarianism while in line with Kantian ethical theory, such will not be universalizable and it is also guilty of using a

particular sex as a means to an end instead of an end in itself.

Conclusion

The arguments so far have been able to underscore the fact that the intercultural approach to gender relation must take into consideration the peculiarities in cultural contexts. Exchanges between cultures must also be done in cognizance of the uniqueness of cultures. Gender relation must be understood contextually and not by explaining one in the light of the other. This is because; what may be seen by a culture as a bad trait in another culture may be the underpinning of that very culture of which when changed or distorted, may cause the collapse of the whole edifice. We have been able to understand that some perceived marginalizing traits in the Western gender relation are the defining features in the Igbo-African gender relation. This is as a result of the difference in the understanding of 'being' in the two worldviews. Whereas the Western understanding of being is in its *singularity*, that of Africa is in its *relatedness* and *interpenetration*. In African ontology, beings interpenetrate one another; it takes one for the other to be and vice versa. This also defines their attitude to gender relation; the Igbo-African sees *oke* and *nwunye* (male and female) taken together as what makes a whole whereas the Westerner sees it as two different realities where the man is his own person and the woman, another; two different and independent individuals. This informs the Igbo-African understanding of motherhood and fatherhood as

inseparable constituents of the whole while the Westerner sees the two as *separables*. This is why practices like homosexuality is repugnant to African ontology unlike in the West. In line with our moral evaluation, approach to African gender relation through the Western lens is morally condemnable because; such will diminish happiness as it does not represent the African ontology thereby violating the utilitarian tradition; secondly, such approach violates Kant's ethical formulations since it is not universalizable for the Western culture may not wish to be seen in the African lens and it will also amounts to treating Africa as just a means instead of an end itself that deserves respect for its uniqueness.

This does not mean that cultures are closed from influence from one another; at least they can agree in some grey areas that generally portend danger to gender relation. These grey areas as pointed out earlier as: inhumane widowhood rites, genital mutilation etc can be radically approached for urgent change since such cannot be morally justified. Igbo-African families should also take into consideration these peculiarities in the grooming of kids. Kids are not to be trained alike without taking note of each person's uniqueness. It would be wrong for African parents to see all the male children in the same light/lens; therefore, parents who teach all the male children that a man does not cook, does not cry, wash etc are also guilty of this overgeneralization. This is because; some male children are naturally inclined to cook and should be groomed in that light; therefore, it will be a disservice to that boy if wrongly

trained into believing that cooking is feminine. Same goes to female children. We will conclude by submitting that both intercultural and intra-cultural approaches to gender relation must be conducted within the fair atmosphere of *peculiarity* and *contextuality*.

Relevant Literature

1. Powers, Thomas.
(Deontology),
www.udel.edu/..deontolog
[y2.pdf](#), 2002 (8/8/15).
2. Kant, Immanuel. (Groundwork of the metaphysics of
Morals), trans. By H. J. Paton, 1964. Harper and Row
Publisher: New York. pp. 1-3.
3. Kant, Groundwork of the metaphysics of Morals, *op. cit.*
pp. 3-4
4. Ekwutosi, Cosmas. (Basic issues in Ethics), 2006. Rex
Charles & Patrick Ltd: Anambra. p. 60.
5. *Ibid.*
6. White, Ronald. (Moral inquiry),
faculty.msj.edu/whiter/ethicsbook.pdf, (8/8/15).
7. Richard T. Hull, (The Varieties of Ethical Theories), 1979,
www.richard-t-hull.com/publications..., (8/8/15).
8. Ekwutosi, Cosmas. *Basic issues in Ethics, op. cit.* 46.
9. Brandt, R. B. (Ethical Theory), 1959. Printice-Hall: New
Jersey. p. 30.
10. Ekwutosi, Cosmas. p. 47.
11. Omoregbe, Joseph. (Ethics: a systematic and historical
study), 1993. Joja Educational Research and Publishers
Limited: Lagos. P. 237.

12. Smart, J. J. J.. and Williams, B. A.. (Utilitarianism- for and against), 1973. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. P. 9.
13. Scheffler, S. (ed), (Consequentialism and its Critics), 1988. Oxford University Press: New York. P. 118.
14. Copleston, Fredrick. (A History of Philosophy), 1985. Vol. VIII, Image Books: Doubleday. P. 10.
15. De Beauvoir, Simone. (The Second Sex), trans., by H. M., Parshley, 1949. Alfred A. Knopf: New York. P.425
16. Ukaulor, Chidimma, (In praise of African Feminism), 2013. Cel-Bez Publishing Co. Nig. Ltd: Owerri. P.72
17. *Op. cit.*, p. 139